the role which the cell assumes is determined by the kind of activity which it is called upon to perform. . . . Given the multiple potency of cells [the cells of the embryo], the competition of cells, the symbiotic relationship of cells, and the tendency of cells to differentiate in accordance with functional demands, we may conceive how orderly development and regeneration may issue as a resultant of these component factors.'

In putting forward this scheme Holmes seems to believe that he is offering a theory compatible with a mechanistic biology. He nowhere recognizes in the cells psychical activity, memory, teleological activity, or any attributes other than physico-chemical properties.

But it is, I think, obvious that his analogy is valid and helpful only in so far as we ascribe to the cells capacities (however lowly) similar to those of the members of the society to which he likens the growing embryo—that is to say, the fundamental psychical capacities of striving toward goals, with intelligent adaptation of means to ends, Holmes' interesting suggestion belongs, therefore, to the present group of speculations, though he perhaps would not readily admit the fact. And it is not in any sense a rival to either form of the monadic theory sketched in the foregoing pages. It is rather a valuable and helpful supplement; it reminds us that the type of psychical activity to be attributed to the lower monads of the human system is not the developed self-conscious and far-sighted activity of the self or supreme monad of the system, but rather, the vaguely

prospective forward-
striving, *relatively* blind and unintelligent
activities of
many levels of clearness of foresight and
comprehension
of relations, illustrated for us in the
immense scale of
animal behaviour from amoeba to infant.